

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

SUBJECT: NHDOT Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting

DATE OF CONFERENCE: July 15, 2009

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: John O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT

Bill Watson
Carol Niewola
Cathy Goodman
Christine Perron
Christopher Bourgue
Dave Smith
Erin Bourgoine
Jon Evans
Keith Cota
Kevin Nyhan
Kirk Mudgett
Laurel Kenna
Marc Laurin
Michelle Marshall
Mike Hazlett
Nancy Mayville
Randy Talon
Rick Faul
Trent Zanes
William Rose

Army Corps of Engineers

Rich Roach

EPA

Mark Kern

**US Fish and Wildlife
Service**

Maria Tur

NHDES

Gino Infascelli
Collis Adams

NH Fish and Game

Carol Henderson

**NH Office of Energy and
Planning**

Jennifer Gilbert

**NH Natural Heritage
Bureau**

Melissa Coppola

NH DRED

Johanna Lyons
Tom Mansfield

City of Keene

Jim Donison

City of Lebanon

Judy Macnab (Conservation
Commission)
Nicole Cormen (City Council)
Rick Dymont (Airport)

**Southern NH Planning
Commission**

Matt Caron

**Strafford Regional Planning
Commission**

Dan Camara

Hoyle Tanner & Associates

Jason Lodge
Sean James

HEB Engineers

Chris Fournier

**Clough Harbor &
Associates**

Don Scott

CLD Engineers

Jamie French
John Byatt

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin

Gordon Leedy
Pete Walker

McFarland Johnson

Jed Merrow

**Hoyle Tanner &
Associates**

Bob Furey

SD Architects

Ward D'Elia

Public Participants

Dianne Officer
Elaine Dolbec
Jeanne Duffy
John Giovagnoli
Kevin Duffy
(Illegible participant)

(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)

PRESENTATIONS/ PROJECTS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

(minutes on subsequent pages)

Finalization of May 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes.....	3
Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-93-1(174)0, 10418C.....	3
Rochester, NHS-027-1(36), 10620D.....	3
Derry, X-A000(919), 13650.....	4
Lincoln-Franconia, A000(808), 15603.....	6
Canaan, X-A000(925), 14446	8
Berlin, X-A-000(052), 12958B	8
Keene, 14441 (Non-Federal).....	9
Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (Non-Federal).....	10
Hampton Beach Redevelopment (No Numbers)	11
Lebanon Airport Runway Improvements, AIP 3-33-0010-41-2009 and 3-33-0010-42-2009	12

(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)

NOTES ON CONFERENCE:

Finalization of May 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes

The May 20, 2009 meeting minutes were finalized.

Salem-Manchester, IM-IR-93-1(174)0, 10418C

This project involves widening Interstate 93 between Salem and Manchester. The Department has been asked by the Giovagnoli family, owners of the proposed mitigation Site 44 in Manchester (as identified in the FEIS), to substitute this parcel for an alternate parcel that they own in the vicinity. A review of the Giovagnoli mitigation proposal, providing a buffer along Mosquito Brook on Site 44 in conjunction with preservation of Site 44 Alternate off Mammoth Road, was discussed.

Marc Laurin provided a handout with information on the proposal. The total preservation on both sites would be approximately 59 acres including 6.2 acres of uplands. This would consist of a 1.6-acre buffer for Mosquito brook on Site 44 and a 4.6-acre upland agricultural conservation easement on Site 44 Alt. He pointed out that the State already owns a ± 10 -acre parcel in close proximity to Site 44 Alt. that has an additional ± 4 acres of wooded uplands.

Mark Kern stated there were a lot of details that need to be ironed out to clarify the limits of the buffer zone on Site 44. He also stated that the buffer zone should remain undisturbed to facilitate natural vegetative growth. Gino Infascelli reiterated these concerns and asked if there were better plans for the Site 44 proposed subdivision. He requested more detailed information on the proposed subdivision treatment measures than have been shown on the previously submitted plans. He also requested that the proposed 2-acre house lot and the wetlands on Site 44 Alt. be more clearly identified. Rich Roach stated that a more specific plan needs to be presented to make the case that this proposal would be as good as the original, which preserved all the uplands on Site 44. M. Laurin will coordinate with the owners to get better details of the proposed subdivision's treatment areas, and the existing wetlands and other features on Site 44 Alt.

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 8/10/1995, 1/10/1999, 2/16/2000, 5/17/2000, 6/14/2000, 7/19/2000, 8/10/2000, 9/20/2000, 10/18/2000, 1/17/2001, 2/14/2001, 3/21/2001, 4/18/2001, 5/10/2001, 8/15/2001, 9/19/2001, 10/17/2001, 11/21/2001, 1/16/2002, 2/20/2002, 5/15/2002, 6/18/2003, 10/15/2003, 12/17/2003, 10/20/2004, 11/17/2004, [1/18/2006](#), [12/19/2007](#), [2/20/2008](#), [10/15/2008](#), [12/17/2008](#), [1/21/2009](#), [4/15/2009](#) & [5/20/2009](#).

Rochester, NHS-027-1(36), 10620D

This project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 16 (Spaulding Turnpike) between Exits 11 and 16.

Kevin Nyhan presented an updated wetland mitigation proposal as a result of the increase in wetland impacts from 12.1 acres to 19.8 acres. The proposal would mitigate 12.1 acres of impact at the ratio expressed in the FEA of approximately 1.16:1. The remainder of the impacts (7.7 acres) would be mitigated at the ratios in DES administrative rules in Table 800-1 (see below).

	Creation	Preservation
City Concrete:	7.3100	0.0000 - city will have preservation elements
Design elements:	0.5500	0.0000
Exit 16 ramp*:	1.5000	0.0000
Henderson*:	10.8000	40.0000
Total:	20.1600	40.0000

K. Nyhan acknowledged that EPA was still awaiting responses to several questions posed in an earlier E-mail. Responses are forthcoming.

Mark Kern stated that he was less concerned with ratios, and most concerned with the Department providing an appropriate mitigation package. He asked if there were additional preservation opportunities around the proposed creation site at Henderson, especially in the vicinity of the south side of the parcel adjacent to Cocheco River. K. Nyhan indicated that he would investigate. M. Kern expressed that the proposed mitigation package could be workable, especially if additional preservation were available adjacent to the river. He requested that a review of the Henderson site be conducted with the resource agencies in late September, early October.

K. Nyhan indicated that he was hopeful that once this mitigation package is finalized and approved, EPA would be able to sign-off on the project impacts and mitigation for all six construction contracts. As it stands right now, only the I-contract was covered by a recent ACOE permit amendment, and the final two construction contracts could not be advertised and awarded until the mitigation is finalized. This scenario currently leaves three construction contracts up in the air (G, H, K).

This project was previously reviewed on the following dates: 10/20/1999, 1/17/2001, 7/17/2002, 12/17/2003, 11/17/2004, [5/21/2008](#), [8/20/2008](#); [2/18/2009](#); [3/18/2009](#) & [5/20/2009](#).

Derry, X-A000(919), 13650

This project involves the complete reconstruction of the Fordway Road Bridge over Beaver Brook (Bridge No. 056/084). Sean James (Project Director) described the project. The existing bridge consists of twin cell metal pipe arches with cast-in-place reinforced concrete and stone masonry headwalls. The pipe arches have a clear span of 17'-0" and a rise of 10'-10". The roadway width is approximately 28' with metal W-beam guardrail on each side. There are cast-in-place reinforced concrete and stone masonry wingwalls at each end of the bridge. The bridge has an AASHTO sufficiency rating of 63.0% and is classified as structurally deficient. The pipe arches were constructed in 1971.

Field observations in conjunction with review of the NHDOT Bridge Inspection Reports found the current condition of the bridge to be in poor condition largely due to the corrosion and deterioration of the steel pipe arches, deterioration of the headwalls and wingwalls, and guardrail condition. The steel pipe arches exhibit distortion and corrosion holes up to 1" in diameter with fill spilling through. There are several distortions and tears throughout the pipe arches. The w-beam guardrail over the bridge and on the approaches exhibits impact damage throughout. The west side headwalls and wingwalls are stone masonry. The stone masonry is voided and settled throughout. The east side headwalls and wingwalls are concrete. The concrete is cracked, spalled and settled throughout. Currently the bridge is posted with an "E-2" sign meaning Certified Vehicles are precluded from using the bridge.

The proposed improvements for the recommended alternative will maintain the existing roadway width on each approach of the bridge to accommodate two (2) lanes of traffic. The proposed bridge will be a precast concrete twin cell box culvert (20' clear span x 12' rise) and permanent steel sheeting wingwalls with an aesthetic cast-in-place concrete facing. This bridge type was chosen because it resulted in minimal adverse environmental impacts to Beaver Brook, simplified water diversion, and economical cost. The estimated construction cost for the proposed improvements is \$1,200,000.

A handout with a brief project description and photographs was distributed. S. James provided a brief history of the existing bridge which was once on the DOT Municipal Redlist, but then removed after some repairs were made. A twin cell box culvert is proposed within the existing disturbed area partially to accommodate the water diversion plan. The first box culvert cell will be installed while Beaver Brook is maintained through one of the existing pipe arches. The second box culvert cell will be installed while Beaver Brook is maintained through the previously installed box culvert cell. The bridge will be installed during a one-month road closure. The permanent steel sheeting wingwalls are anticipated to be installed with a single, two-way, traffic control operation. The approach roadway will be improved by increasing sight distance on the north approach and improving the intersection with Brook Street (north approach). The project is "ARRA-Related" and will go out to bid in December 2009 and will be constructed during the summer of 2010.

The existing bridge is less than 40 years old and the proposed work is within the disturbed area. As such, the NHDOT Cultural Resources Committee has not required the project to be presented to them. There are no known occurrences of Federal or State endangered or threatened species according to the Natural Heritage Bureau. There is a minor easement required in the southwest quadrant. There are three temporary easements required at the other quadrants, all on municipal parcels. There are no 4(f), 6(f), LCIP properties, or prime wetlands affected by the project. This project will require a standard dredge and fill wetland permit and a Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act permit.

Rich Roach asked about the proposed stream bottom material. S. James explained that the bottom slab of the culvert will be buried 2' and baffles will be specified along the bottom of the culvert and filled with natural streambed material.

Carol Henderson asked when the project would be built. S. James explained that the in-stream work would occur during low flow months (July and August).

R. Roach asked about foundation work. S. James explained that the box culvert would be placed on 1' structural fill. The existing soils are good.

Kevin Nyhan asked about the impacted wetlands. J. Lodge explained that the wetland impacts are estimated to be less than 3,000 square feet and that these are impacts restricted to the immediate vicinity of the bridge. No roadway work will result in wetland impacts.

R. Roach concluded that the project would qualify for coverage under the NH Programmatic General Permit.

No further action or meetings were requested by those present.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Lincoln-Franconia, A000(808), 15603

Mike Hazlett gave an overview of the project. This is a 4R project that will consist of the reconstruction of the Franconia Notch Parkway from Exit 34A to Exit 34C (approx. 5.8 miles). The purpose of this presentation was to discuss three issues: repair of a small dam, replacement of the guardrail, and removal of the existing curb

The Parkway was constructed in the mid-1980s with only a ¾" overlay applied to the pavement since that time. The pavement is severely deteriorated and requires a combination of pavement inlay and overlay to prevent the need for a much more extensive, disruptive, and expensive treatment in the future.

About 2/3 of the length has two opposing single lanes of traffic with a narrow median between those lanes. The median was 3 feet wide and consisted of granite "logs" intended as a visual and audible separation between the opposing lanes. This treatment did not prove effective as a number of fatal head on collisions occurred in this area generating considerable expression of public concern. Subsequently, the granite logs were removed and double-faced Cor-ten thrie beam guardrail was installed. This was a very difficult task as the highway had been built with a crushed stone base that is very resistant to normal installation practices. This resulted in traffic traveling very close to the face of the rail and the front wheel nuts of some large trucks have actually gashed the rail. Overall, the Cor-ten guardrail both within the median and along the sides of the highway is severely deteriorated and galvanized rail is proposed for the replacement. No one had any concerns with this. Kevin Nyhan said that in the past the Department had an agreement with the US Forest Service to use rusty rail within the National Forest; however, the Forest Service no longer requires this due to the short life span of the rusty rail. Carol Henderson asked how the Department decides between guardrail and jersey barrier. A number of factors are considered in the decision, including cost, safety, and environmental issues. M. Hazlett explained that the biggest concern in this location is wildlife crossing, as well as the added expense of installing additional drainage with jersey barrier.

A small dam is located on an unnamed pond on the east side of the Parkway at mile marker 110.1. This dam has a crack down its face, and the proposed repair involves casting another concrete face against the existing face to seal the crack. DRED owns the dam. Melissa Coppola asked if DRED has been contacted about the project. Christine Perron said that initial contact has been made with someone from Parks and coordination would continue. Rich Roach indicated that he had no concerns about the proposed dam repair. C. Henderson asked if a cofferdam would be used during the repair. M. Hazlett explained a small cofferdam would be installed and water would be diverted into an existing overflow channel. Dave Smith asked if there were any concerns with covering the existing stone face with smooth concrete. R. Roach said that was not a concern. C. Henderson added that DRED should provide input on that issue, and she asked that the water level in the pond be kept the same since Fish & Game likely stocks the pond.

Much of the project area has low reveal curb (3"). Because of heavy vehicles and plows driving on this curb over the years, much of it is now level or nearly level with the pavement. The purpose of the curb, as described in the agreement with the "White Mountain Council", was to protect the vegetated panels; however, these panels are currently very sparsely and poorly vegetated, particularly compared with Interstate segments elsewhere in the state. Removing this curb, grading the material behind it, and re-establishing the vegetation with grass is proposed. With the area graded down and away from the pavement it is expected that the new vegetation would have a much better opportunity to establish and maintain itself. Additional catch basins will be added to cut portions of the roadway and runoff would sheet flow in all other sections of roadway. Sheet flow would provide additional treatment compared to the current closed drainage system at the face of the curb. Stone may be necessary in the ditch lines, especially on steeper grades, but this is still being studied. Mark Kern indicated that sheet flow was a good option, and he asked if the Council still exists. Kevin Nyhan replied that the Department is still trying to determine if there is still such an entity. Gino Infascelli said that he likes the proposal to allow sheet flow. M. Coppola asked that native species be planted in the panels to avoid any potential impacts that weedy species could have on nearby rare species and exemplary natural communities.

Many of the drainage basins and some of the drainage pipes have deteriorated and need repair and/or replacement. In part this may be due to the difficult winter conditions and the requirement for salt usage to maintain safe vehicular passage, plus acid rain, and placement of pipes adjacent to wetlands. Details on drainage and wetland impacts will be discussed at a future meeting.

Kirk Mudgett said that some clearing would be done as part of the project. M. Coppola asked for clarification. K. Mudgett explained that some clearing of balsam fir would be necessary at a few locations to maintain the 32' clear zone. Extensive clearing would not be necessary.

A general comment made by several in attendance was that these issues need to be discussed with DRED. D. Smith noted that the Department would be coordinating with DRED on these issues.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Canaan, X-A000(925), 14446

Chris Fournier, from H.E. Bergeron Engineers, met with the NHDOT Natural Resource Committee on Wednesday, July 15, 2009 to discuss a project in Canaan, NH. The project is located on River Road at the bridge crossing of the Mascoma River. The NHDOT bridge number is 123/126. The NHDOT project number is 14446. The Federal project number is X-A000(925).

The existing bridge has a span of 42 feet. It consists of stone and concrete abutments, steel stringers, and a timber deck. The existing bridge is in poor condition, is on the NHDOT "Red List" and is currently closed. An NHDOT Bailey bridge is currently in place upstream. The bridge replacement project is scheduled to receive funding through a combination of 60% non-ARRA federal highway funds and 40% State Aid Bridge funds.

The proposed bridge will have a span of 48 feet and will consist of cast-in-place concrete abutments and a precast concrete deck slab. Stone will be placed immediately in front of the new abutments in order to protect the new footings from scour.

A total of 1,050 square feet of wetlands will be impacted during this project. A wetlands and non-site specific permit has already been obtained from NHDES. The NHDES permit number is 2008-01046. The ACOE permit number is NAE-2009-00243. This is considered a minor impact project.

Maria Tur asked if there were any NHB hits. C. Fournier responded that the NH Natural Heritage database was checked for records of rare and exemplary natural communities near the project site and no records were found.

Berlin, X-A-000(052), 12958B

Trent Zanes described the project. This project involves the reconstruction and relocation of NH Route 110 from Green Street to Wight Street. The project is located in an urban residential area to the west of downtown. No wetlands are located within the immediate impact area. The amount of impervious surfaces in the project area will be reduced as a result of the project.

There are drainage issues that may require the construction of a new storm water outlet that may require minor impacts to the Dead River. Kirk Mudgett described the drainage issues and proposed treatment options that may be designed if this new storm water outlet is to be constructed. There are contamination concerns at one of the proposed treatment sites that will need to be further investigated and coordinated with NHDES.

Carol Henderson asked about the impacts to the Dead River if this outlet were to be constructed. Marc Laurin replied that any impacts to the river itself would most likely only be temporary.

Gino Infascelli asked if stormwater treatment would be provided if an outlet were to be constructed. M. Laurin replied that treatment measures would be further investigated. No additional concerns were expressed by the agencies, though the project will need to be brought back for review should

the Department, in consultation with the City of Berlin, decide to pursue the new drainage outlet to the Dead River.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Keene, 14441 (Non-Federal)

A review of design, alternatives and anticipated impacts was presented.

Don Scott opened the presentation with the survey plan of the Spring St. Bridge. The proposed project consists of the replacement of the bridge that carries Spring Street over Beaver Brook (Br. No. 140/078). The bridge will be replaced by slipping a box culvert between the existing abutments. This design minimizes disturbance. The bottom of the box will be constructed to be level with the existing concrete channel south of the bridge. The granite block walls north of the bridge will be rebuilt in-kind for a length of about 10 feet to the north. D. Scott explained that the existing bridge has four drainage outlets on all four corners, a water main under the abutments and areas of erosion under the existing abutments. A Natural Heritage Bureau review indicated that Common Nighthawk and Wood Turtle occur in the vicinity.

Rich Roach commented that there does not appear to be much of a natural environment left. He asked if the box culvert would restrict the flow of the brook. D. Scott responded that the box culvert will restrict the flow by 8" on both sides of the box culvert but an 18" increase in its height would enlarge the overall hydrologic opening.

Melissa Coppola asked if Kim Tuttle had been contacted regarding the threatened or endangered wildlife species found in the NHNHB search. D. Scott indicated that he had not yet done this. M. Coppola indicated that she had spoken to K. Tuttle who had initially indicated that the proposed project would likely not be of concern but that CHA needs to have an official letter from NH Fish & Game.

Carol Henderson was concerned about the extension of the concrete bottom over the natural bottom. D. Scott stated that a three-sided culvert would require footings and the removal of the existing abutments. The intent was not to increase the area of disturbance.

Gino Infascelli stated that the project will need a standard Dredge & Fill permit. The channel north has a natural bottom and the channel south is concrete for some distance. R. Roach indicated that the project would qualify for coverage under the NH Programmatic General Permit. It was suggested that the permit application indicate how much the overall concrete channel would increase as a result of this project.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Merrimack-Nashua, 13964 (Non-Federal)

John Byatt presented the project to the group. The Town of Merrimack and City of Nashua would like to replace the existing Manchester St. Bridge over the Pennichuck Reservoir. The existing bridge is a 22-foot single span structure consisting of a concrete deck on steel I-beams. The substructure consists of tall dry laid stone abutments and wingwalls. An approximate 400-foot long fill causeway through the reservoir approaches the bridge. The reservoir is a prime wetland.

The proposed bridge structure is a 120-foot long 3-span bridge with relatively short concrete abutments and wingwalls supported on drilled shafts. The proposed bridge would be built over and behind the existing stone substructures. The existing superstructure would be removed in its entirety. The existing stone abutments and wingwalls would be left in place except for the top 4.5 feet or so. The existing top several feet of the wingwalls have slid outwards and need to be removed to allow access under the bridge. Increasing the bridge span lessens wetland impacts compared to replacing the bridge in-kind, as areas that would be fill for a replacement in-kind would now instead be bridge deck.

The bridge and approaches will be widened to accommodate a sidewalk and guardrail panels. The profile will also be raised approximately 1-foot to accommodate a deeper bridge superstructure and place a superelevation in the roadway cross section. The widening and profile increase will necessitate that fill be placed in the reservoir. Several alignments are possible but all will strive to keep wetland and in-stream impacts under 10,000 sf. The fill slopes will consist mostly of clean stone and riprap. Best management practices for erosion control and a dam drawdown will be used to minimize water quality impacts during construction. The stability of the new slopes, on top of the poor existing fill soils, still needs to be performed.

Coordination has occurred with Pennichuck Water Works (PWW) who operates the reservoir. They are not opposed to the project or the required fills but would like to ensure that water quality standards are maintained during construction. Further coordination will continue with PWW to discuss treatment swales and other concerns.

A pre-submittal meeting with DES Wetlands to discuss the project was previously held. No NHB review had been done yet.

At the Cultural Resource meeting the previous week, NHDHR asked if impacts to the stone wingwalls could be avoided. In order to do this the roadway may have to be raised approximately 4.5 more feet. This would increase wetland impacts even more. John said CLD would evaluate the amount of impacts due to raising the roadway profile.

Gino Infascelli indicated that the wetland mitigation rules should be checked as the 10,000 sf impact threshold is not the only circumstance under which mitigation would be required.

Rich Roach asked if the roadway width could be narrowed to 20 feet. John replied that the traffic volumes were too high to narrow the road any more than the existing 28-foot width.

Carol Henderson asked how many piles would be used and if any existing fills were to be removed. J. Byatt replied that perhaps 6 to 7 piles would be used per substructure element. He replied that existing fills under the bridge would be removed to allow access to the underside of the bridge.

It was asked if water would fill the areas where the wall and fills will be removed. John replied that these areas would be inundated with water. Nancy Mayville asked if removal of the walls and fill could be considered mitigation as additional wetland area would be created. J. Byatt indicated that he felt it should be considered mitigation but that a definite answer had not yet been determined.

Kevin Nyhan asked if u-back wingwalls were being used to limit impacts. John replied that approximately 10-foot long u-back wingwalls were to be used at each corner of the bridge.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Hampton Beach Redevelopment (No Numbers)

This project involves a feasibility study for the redevelopment of the public facilities at Hampton Beach State Park, most notably the Hampton Seashell complex. The study includes preliminary designs for buildings, landscape and public space improvements, a cost estimate and report on the economic impact of these improvements in terms of the state and local economy. An initial project review was presented.

Tom Mansfield, DRED gave a brief overview of the project, redevelopment of state park facilities at Hampton Beach State Park. The project involves the replacement and enhancement of facilities at the Seashell, as well as construction of two new bath house/toilet facilities at Haverhill Street and at the Marine Memorial. Minor modifications to the seawall structure are proposed, as is the reconstruction of the parking areas along the beach. At the south beach facility, renovation of the maintenance garage and construction of a new visitor center are proposed.

Gordon Leedy, VHB gave an overview of the anticipated permitting activities. Permit applications are anticipated for wetland/tidal buffer impacts, Alteration of Terrain, and Comprehensive Shoreland Protection Act impact areas. It is unlikely that the project have impacts within the jurisdiction of the US Army Corps of Engineers unless the project proposes impacts below the high tide line. It is not known at this time the extent of Federal funding participation in the project, but it is anticipated that up to \$3.5 million will be funded through highway programs.

Rich Roach stressed that compliance with Executive Order 10988 regarding flooding and hurricane resistant building standards will need to be addressed. Kevin Nyhan indicated that any Federal involvement through funding, permitting or any other action would require compliance with the necessary Federal regulations including NEPA and Section 106. He also indicated that should the Federal Highway Administration be involved compliance with additional regulations such as Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act would be required.

Gino Infascelli indicated that the project would likely be classified as a major project as it involves impacts to public waters and would therefore require the final approval of the Governor and

Council. Melissa Coppola recommended that landscaping plans use only native vegetation. Additionally, it was noted that the project should be coordinated with NHDOT project 14532W, a project to modify the storm water system associated with Ocean Boulevard, a state road. Carol Henderson asked whether the project had been reviewed for possible impacts to piping plovers during the nesting season. Gordon Leevy, identified the location of the piping plovers relative to the proposed project and it was determined that the project would not have any impacts to breeding plovers.

This project has not been previously discussed at a Monthly Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting.

Lebanon Airport Runway Improvements, AIP 3-33-0010-41-2009 and 3-33-0010-42-2009

Lebanon Airport topics of discussion:

- Lebanon Airport Master Plan Supplement (AIP #3-33-0010-32-2007 and AIP 3-33-0010-34-2007)
- Lebanon Airport Environmental Assessment (AIP #3-33-0010-41-2009 and AIP 3-33-0010-42-2009)
- South Apron Mitigation Project

Lebanon Airport Manager Rick Dymont introduced attendees and noted that the purpose of the presentation was threefold: to update attendees on the Master Plan Supplement and decisions on alternatives; to inform them of the upcoming Environmental Assessment (EA) for proposed runway and safety area improvements; and to discuss the latest South Ramp wetland mitigation developments.

Airport Master Plan Supplement:

Bob Furey of HTA described the Master Plan Supplement process. He noted that approximately 20 runway alternatives had been studied and were narrowed down to 3 alternatives. There are two Runway 18-36 alternatives, both involving constructing a parallel taxiway, lengthening the runway, and shifting it south in order to accommodate the design aircraft and bring safety areas up to FAA standards. Alternative P10 would maintain the existing runway alignment, while P12 would rotate the runway to a new alignment, and the runway would be designated Runway 1-19. One alternative is under consideration for the east-west Runway 7-25. This involves maintaining the pavement area but reducing the useable runway length. Runway 7-25 would then become the secondary runway. There are also two alternatives under consideration for removing the hill south of the north-south runway.

The Master Plan will be put on hold, so alternatives described above can be addressed in detail in an EA. Work on the EA just started. When the EA is completed and alternatives have been selected for final design and implementation, the Master Plan Supplement would be completed.

Environmental Assessment:

Jed Merrow described the main components of the EA, the key resource issues, and proposed resource agency involvement. The most notable impacts at this point appear to be wetland impacts and the effects of removing the hill south of Runway 36. Wetland mitigation will be an important

topic of discussion as well. Resource agencies will be asked to review the alternatives screening; attend a site visit to see the airport facilities and natural resources; review technical materials as appropriate; attend City board meetings if needed; and attend the Draft EA public hearing. The project team will try to keep the agencies updated and involved. The EA is expected to take about 18 months to complete.

South Apron Mitigation Project:

Rick Dymont of Lebanon Airport updated attendees on the status of wetland mitigation for the South Apron project. The mitigation consists of two parts. The first was a payment of \$150,000, which was to be used for a mitigation project but was ultimately provided to the Lebanon Open Space Trust (LOST) for conservation purposes. The second was preservation of additional land with a conservation easement, which has not been completed. The 113-acre airport parcel under consideration for preservation was modified at the request of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF) to exclude a proposed perimeter road and terrain removal area, resulting in a total of 75 acres remaining for preservation. (Terrain removal will be needed to eliminate areas where the ground elevation exceeds FAA requirements.) However, because this is airport property, FAA would still need the airport to retain an aviation (aerial navigation) easement, which includes vegetation clearing rights, over the parcel. [Note: The airport parcel was previously considered City land not obligated to the FAA. Recently, the parcel was found to be obligated to the FAA, and as a result, is subject to FAA aviation easement requirements.] The proposed easement holder, SPNHF, will not accept an easement with these vegetation clearing provisions. FAA will not forfeit the vegetation clearing rights. Rick asked whether, if another easement holder can be found, the parcel would still be acceptable as mitigation.

Collis Adams of NHDES noted that the mitigation search has taken 3 years and needs to be resolved as soon as possible. Collis noted the date for completion of mitigation requirements is September 30, 2009. He further noted that the clearing, stumping, grading, and airport activities would make the site insufficient for mitigation. Mark Kern of EPA agreed and stated a preference for off-site mitigation. Collis stated that NHDES prefers the so-called Boston Lot, which he said has good conservation value and can be put under easement quickly. A different parcel could be difficult to implement in a timely manner, and the case would probably have to be referred to the Attorney General's office by NHDES for enforcement action.

Collis further noted that the in-lieu fee program, involve contributions to the Aquatic Resource Management (ARM) fund, is not applicable for projects with over 3 acres wetland impact. The in-lieu fee cost for 3 acres of impact would be approximately \$398,573; if the South Apron project could use this approach, the 5+ acres of impact would cost approximately \$697,500.

Nicole Cormen of Lebanon stated that she shared the agencies' frustration with the project and interest in getting it resolved. She noted that the remaining Boston Lot acreage was not the preferred option locally because that land had been transferred to the city by Dartmouth College in conjunction with planning board approval of a development project. She stated that the land should be conserved anyway, although she acknowledged that this was not a condition of the approval. Nevertheless, the conservation commission as well as the majority of the city council felt it would be "double dipping" to use the Boston Lot parcel as compensation for airport wetland impacts. She acknowledged that the City has determined it is not conserved or required to be conserved.

According to Nicole Cormen, the conservation commission and a majority of the City Council also had reasoned that the airport parcel was more appropriate mitigation than the Boston Lot because the airport parcel is in the same subwatershed as the wetland impacts, and it buffers the abutting rural residential neighborhood, Farnum Hill Reserve, and high-value wetlands and rich mesic areas to the south of Hall Road, as recently identified in the citywide natural-resource inventory currently underway.

Judy Macnab of Lebanon described another possible option, referred to as Mascoma Shores, which is a privately-owned proposed development parcel in Lebanon on Route 4A near the Enfield town line, across the road from Mascoma Lake. It is believed to be about 40 acres. It was previously offered to the City if the owner is unsuccessful in obtaining an Alteration of Terrain (AOT) permit to build residences on the property. It has steep areas, uplands, and wetlands; is near conservation land and Mascoma Lake; is threatened by development; has wildlife habitat value; has scenic views; and is upstream of the City's water supply. The asking price, market value, exact acreage, amount of wetlands, and other details were unavailable at the meeting, but Judy and Nicole will investigate it and send information around. They believe an easement holder could easily be found for this parcel. Collis noted that the parcel has to be at least 10 times the impact acreage, at least half upland, and under some threat of development. Rich Roach noted that the purchase cost could not greatly exceed fair market value. Collis will contact Ridge Mauck regarding the AOT permit status. He noted that consideration of this parcel needs to proceed very quickly or the City would have to move to conserve the Boston Lot, make an in-lieu fee payment if allowed, or enforcement action.

Agency staff noted that the South Apron mitigation must be resolved before the agencies will consider other airport actions and environmental impacts.

This airport was previously discussed on the following dates: [7/18/2007](#) & [9/17/2008](#).